



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,941	12/21/2001	Larry Russell	PW-0278623	3834

7590

01/10/2005

Law Office of Karry W Wang
555 Pierce Street #1043
Albany, CA 94706

EXAMINER

BLACK, LINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/028,941	Applicant(s) RUSSELL, LARRY	
	Examiner LINH BLACK	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pekowski et al. (USP 6557007), and further in view of Mikurak (USP 6606744).

1. As per independent claims 1 and 12, Pekowski et al. teach:

A method of providing information of a conference, comprising the steps of: collecting the information; compiling the collected information into an electronic database – col. 1, lines 35-54; fig. 2, elements 32, 66, 62; figs. 4-5, element 204; col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 28 (where all information related to shows are gathered and saved to the database).

distributing the database in an electronic medium – col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 28 (in which the server is the electronic medium/node that contains the database). Users can view trade-show information on the computer – col. 6, lines 19-44.

Art Unit: 2167

Mircrosoft Computer Dictionary – Fourth Edition teaches:

- “database server” as a network node, or station, dedicated to storing and providing access to a shared database.
- “distribute” as to allocate among location or facilities as in a data-processing function that is performed by a collection of computers and other devices linked together by a network.

However, Pekowski et al. does not explicitly teach “via solicitation”. Mikurak teaches “Providing Collaborative Installation Management in a Network-Based Supply Chain Environment” – the title. Mikurak further teaches collect/gather information via solicitation – col. 248, lines 20-30. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak’s teaching with Pekowski et al.’s teaching in order to allow different methods of data collection to efficiently collect information.

2. As per claim 2, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the conference is a tradeshow, the database is a searchable database viewable via a computer program - col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 28. However, Pekowski et al. does not explicitly teach the electronic medium is a Compact Disk. Mikurak further teaches compact disks are used to store databases of information – col. 25, lines 19-36; col. 89, lines 25-45; col. 195, line 64 to col. 196, line 13. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak’s teaching with Pekowski et

al.'s teaching in order to allow the distribution of tradeshow information on CD-ROM to allow users with different computer systems to access to tradeshow's information.

3. As per claims 3, 13, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the step of collecting the information comprises uploading the information onto a web site – col. 6, lines 63 to col. 7, line 17.
4. As per claims 4, 17, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the step of collecting the information comprises uploading the information onto a wireless network – col. 7, lines 25-30.
5. As per claim 6, Pekowski et al. teach providing a computer at the tradeshow; and viewing the information in the database on the computer – col. 1, line 45 to col. 2, lines 67.
6. As per claim 7, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the information comprises a vendor's product information, web site address, catalogue information, and the vendor's location at the tradeshow – col. 8, lines 9-27.
7. As per claims 8, 11, 15, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the information is collected prior to the tradeshow and the database is distributed in a time frame selected from the group consisting of prior to the tradeshow, during the tradeshow, and after the

Art Unit: 2167

tradeshow – col. 8, lines 9-27; fig. 4; col. 10, lines 3-19; col. 32, lines 18-39. (Users can access updated current information such as add information before the tradeshow, edit/buy information during the show, and checked for updated information after the tradeshow such as shipping information etc...)

8. As per claims 9, 10, 16, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the conference is a trade-show, the database is a searchable database viewable via a computer program – col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 28. However, Pekowski et al. does not explicitly teach the database is viewable via a PDA. Mikurak teaches distributors' information can be viewable via PDAs – col. 201, lines 38-64. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak's teaching with Pekowski et al.'s teaching in order to allow users on different computer/accessing devices/environments to be able to access the tradeshow database efficiently.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pekowski et al. (USP 6557007), Mikurak (USP 6606744), and further in view of Aggarwal (USP 6775298).

9. As per claim 18, Pekowski et al. teach collecting the information; electronically compiling the collected information into a downloadable database; and downloading

the database onto an electronic medium for viewing. And Mikurak further teaches collect/gather information via solicitation – Please see claim 1 above. However, Pekowski et al. and Mikurak do not explicitly suggest a downloadable database. However, Aggarwal teaches data transfer mechanism for handheld devices over a wireless communication link – the title. Aggarwal teach downloadable database – col. 15, lines 4-20. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak and Pekowski et al.'s teaching's with Aggarwal's teaching in order to allow users the choice of downloading the tradeshow database efficiently access information either work off-line or on-line or to reduce/limit the network connections.

10. As per claim 19, Pekowski et al. teach wherein the step of collecting the information comprises uploading the information onto a web site – col. 6, lines 63 to col. 7, line 17.

11. As per claim 20, Pekowski et al. does not explicitly teach the electronic medium is selected from the Group consisting of personal computers etc.... Mikurak teaches distributors' information can be viewable via PDAs – col. 201, lines 38-64. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak's teaching with Pekowski et al.'s teaching in order to allow users on different computer/accessing devices/environments to be able to access the tradeshow database efficiently.

12. As of claim 21, Pekowski et al. wherein the conference is a tradeshow, the database is a searchable database viewable via a computer program and accessible via the Internet - col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 28.

13. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pekowski et al. (USP 6557007), Mikurak (USP 6606744), and further in view of DeLorme et al. (USP 5948040).

14. As per claim 5, Pekowski et al. and Mikurak do not explicitly teach wherein the computer program is integrated with the database. However, DeLorme et al. teach "Travel Reservation Information and Planning System" – the title. DeLorme et al. teach a computer program is integrated with the database on a CD – col. 10, lines 9-17. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak's and Pekowski et al.'s teaching with DeLorme et al.'s teaching in order to allow users to effectively access to information stored on distributed CDs.

15. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pekowski et al. (USP 6557007), Mikurak (USP 6606744), and further in view of Thenery (USP 4806743).

Art Unit: 2167

As per claim 14, Pekowski et al. and Mikurak do not explicitly teach the computer is located in a dedicated kiosk or booth at the tradeshow. However, Thenery teaches “installation for managing the “visistor” resource at a trade show, or fair, or the like” – the title. Thenery teaches “The present invention relates in general to computerized installations for facilitating the exchange of information between serving entities and the people that may come into contact with said entities. The term “serving entity” is used to cover, in particular, exhibitors or the like present at trade shows or other exhibitions or fairs, with the above-mentioned people then being visitors, members of the press, and personalities who may make contact with said exhibitors” – col. 1, lines 5-15. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak, Pekowski et al.’s teachings with Thenery’s teaching in order to allow not only off-site but also conveniently on-site accesses to trade-show information.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pekowski et al. (USP 6557007), Mikurak (USP 6606744), Aggarwal (USP 6775298), and further in view of Thenery (USP 4806743).

17. As per claim 22, Pekowski et al., Mikurak, and Aggarwal do not explicitly teach the electronic medium is located at the tradeshow. However, Thenery teaches “installation for managing the “visistor” resource at a trade show, or fair, or the like” – the title. Thenery teaches “The present invention relates in general to computerized installations for facilitating the exchange of information between serving entities and the people that

Art Unit: 2167

may come into contact with said entities. The term "serving entity" is used to cover, in particular, exhibitors or the like present at trade shows or other exhibitions or fairs, with the above-mentioned people then being visitors, members of the press, and personalities who may make contact with said exhibitors" – col. 1, lines 5-15. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mikurak, Pekowski et al., and Aggarwal's teachings with Thenery's teaching in order to allow not only off-site but also conveniently on-site accesses to trade-show information.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH BLACK whose telephone number is 571-272-4106. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN BREENE can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2167

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Linh Black

LINH BLACK
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

October 27, 2004

John S. Wasson
Primary Examiner